k Dickson G-5 (1929-47) 1951 MI 1 Kuwait
Bedouins MJ4

629 of a tribesman being able to collect the sum laid down by the Shari'ah
671 Law.

This money settlement for killing a person is known as *fasl* among the Iraq tribes, and is usually accompanied by the payment of a further sum of honour money or *hashm* if the act was a breach of tribal honour.

For example, in 1916, when I was rather stupidly ambushed and wounded near Suq ash Shuyukh on my way back from a local wedding, I had taken the precaution to have a *rafiq* or safe conduct with me in the person of my old friend, Shaikh Qasid al Nahi, of the Hacham tribe, and two others. I therefore was offered by the Shaikh of the tribe responsible for my safety (Shaikh Qasid) the special sums of Rs.500 plus Rs.400. The former being *fasl* for my spilt blood (no bones broken), and the latter *hashm* or honour money, seeing that I had been hurt whilst under the protection of a *rafiq* of the tribe which shot me.

In the desert this word *fasl* is scarcely known, nor is the word *hashm* understood in the above sense except by a few. Instead the term *'idiyah* or *diyah* is universally used. The meaning is the same as *fasl*, but the word is truer Arabic.

628 While in Iraq it is practically always possible to settle a murder
682 case by means of this *fasl* or blood-money system, such settlement is unusual in the desert and in Najd proper. It depends almost entirely on the wishes of the relatives of the person killed. In other words, if a man is killed in a private quarrel his parents, or if he has none, his nearest relatives, are asked if they will accept *'idiyah* or desire their *haq* or rights. If they agree to accept *'idiyah* well and good, if not then the slayer's life is forfeit, and it is the business of the ruler or shaikh of the tribes to see the death sentence carried out. In the great majority of cases the executioner is one of the nearest relatives of the man killed.

In carrying out the death sentence it is important that the act of retribution be carried out in exactly the same way and by exactly the same means as the dead man was in the first place done to death.

For example, if A was shot through the head by B, A's relatives must arrange to shoot B through the head and in no other place.
628 Or again, in the case of a wilful hurt not amounting to killing, if C
683 was cut over the head with a sword by D, C's relatives must inflict

k Dickson G-5 (1929-47) 1951 MI 1 Kuwait MI 1
Bedouins MJ4

A Savage Mother

exactly the same wound and with a sword on D's head as D inflicted on C. He must not exceed his right in taking his vengeance by one jot or tittle, else he himself lays himself open to counter punishment, and the feud proceeds.

The Shaikh of Kuwait told me the following rather harrowing story of an event which took place in Kuwait about 1927, and which illustrates the stern determination of the Badawin of the desert to enforce what they deem the just law of retribution.

A Mutairi tribal woman living in Kuwait had three sons (the father had died some years previously). One day the eldest son quarrelled with the second son in the market place, and in a fit of rage shot him through the heart. The shot man died almost immediately and the murderer was arrested. The mother, on being asked by the shaikh what sort of punishment she wanted him to inflict on her eldest son replied that she demanded his life, and straightway called upon him to order her youngest son to shoot his elder brother. The shaikh, filled with horror at the woman's unnatural demand, and especially at the idea of turning the youngest boy also into a fratricide, pleaded for several days with the woman. At the same time he pointed out that it was quite unnecessary for her to lose two of her sons at one stroke, seeing that the killing was unpremeditated. He therefore asked her to allow him to judge the matter as he thought fit. The mother was, however, adamant. Consequently the third boy, who was greatly devoted to his two elder brothers, was given a rifle and ordered to shoot his surviving brother in the heart, and in the public market square. He refused point blank, and repeatedly threw the proffered rifle on the ground. Finally on being pressed he fainted, and the execution had to be carried out by the shaikh's own guards. Local Badawin opinion fully agreed with the mother's decision, and the way the execution was carried out, but the unhappy mother was left with only her third son, who, hating her for her ferocity, refused to live with her or even to support her any more.

It is understood among the Badawin of to-day that no blood money can legitimately be claimed in the case of a man killed in regular battle between two tribes at war. This is simply because it is impossible for men to recognise one another in a long-range fight with modern firearms. Nevertheless if a man be recognised in the course